

1
2
3
4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
5 FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
6 AT SEATTLE

7 CRAIG PEDEN,

8 Plaintiff,

9 v.
10

11 CATHOLIC COMMUNITY SERVICES OF
12 WESTERN WASHINGTON, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.
14

Case No. C17-1610 RSM

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
MOTION FOR RECONSIDERATION

15 THIS MATTER comes before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration. Dkt.
16 #12. *Pro Se* Plaintiff filed his initial Complaint on October 30, 2017. Dkt. #3. At the same time,
17 Plaintiff filed an Emergency Motion for Injunction, which the Court construed as a Motion for
18 Temporary Restraining Order ("TRO"), and ultimately denied. Dkts. #4 and #5. Plaintiff alleged
19 in his initial Complaint that Catholic Charities agreed to pay his rent for October through the end
20 of his lease in December 2017. Dkt. #3. He also appeared to allege some type of retaliation and
21 discrimination, although he did not allege that he is a member of any protected class, nor did he
22 provide the details of such allegations. *See id.* The circumstances surrounding Plaintiff's
23 allegations and request were not apparent from the initial Complaint or the motion itself.
24
25

26 On October 31, 2017, the Court directed Plaintiff to file an Amended Complaint to cure
27 certain deficiencies. Dkt. #6. Plaintiff filed his Amended Complaint on November 21, 2017.
28

1 Dkt. #7. Plaintiff named five new Defendants in the Amended Complaint, and appeared to
2 abandon his prior legal claims. *See* Dkt. #7 at 2-4. Instead, he raised allegations of federal Due
3 Process and Civil Rights violations. Dkt. #7 at 3. He also appeared to raise allegations of federal
4 housing violations. *Id.* Plaintiff made general averments of harassment, defamation,
5 stigmatization, and discrimination on the basis that he is a divorced, single, bisexual male with
6 AIDS, but no specifics were provided. *Id.* at 6. His allegations appeared to cover a time period
7 between 2013 and 2017. *Id.* Because Mr. Peden failed to explain how each of the Defendants
8 had violated any federal law, and failed to explain why some of his actions were not barred by
9 the applicable statutes of limitations, the Court directed Mr. Peden to file a Second Amended
10 Complaint. Dkt. #8. Mr. Peden did not comply with that Order. Instead, on February 2, 2018,
11 Mr. Peden filed a second Motion for Temporary Restraining Order and Injunction and a Motion
12 to Appoint Counsel. Dkts. #9 and #10.

15 On February 5, 2018, the Court denied Plaintiff's motion for TRO and dismissed his case.
16 Dkt. #11. The Court found that, as with Mr. Peden's previous filings, the motion suffered from
17 numerous deficiencies, including that the legal bases of the motion were unclear, it did not appear
18 that the motion had been served on any of the named Defendants, and Plaintiff failed to include
19 any legal argument in support of his motion. *Id.*

21 Plaintiff has now moved for reconsideration, asserting that the Court should grant his
22 motion for TRO "if for no other reason than the status within the protected class demands scrutiny
23 of the protected's [sic] interest." Dkt. #12 at ¶ 2. He then speaks at length about a case he
24 previously brought in this Court, *Peden v. Murray*, C14-0499JLR, that was dismissed under 28
25 U.S.C. § 1915(e). *Id.* at ¶¶ 4-6. Plaintiff also states that all Orders from this Court that are being
26
27
28

1 mailed to him must be announced by telephone and/or text because his mailbox has been
2 compromised by people wishing to harm him. Dkt. #12 at ¶ 1.

3 “Motions for reconsideration are disfavored. The court will ordinarily deny such motions
4 in the absence of a showing of manifest error in the prior ruling or a showing of new facts or
5 legal authority which could not have been brought to its attention earlier with reasonable
6 diligence.” LCrR 12(b)(10). The Court is unable to discern from the instant motion, what errors
7 Plaintiff alleges in the Court’s Order dismissing his case. Plaintiff does not present a single legal
8 authority in support of his motion, nor does he actually reference any specific portion of the
9 Court’s prior Order. Instead, he focuses the bulk of his motion on a four-year-old case that did
10 not proceed before the Undersigned. Further, that case (*Peden v. Murray*) was never highlighted
11 in any pleadings before the Court in this current action. As a result, nothing presented by Plaintiff
12 in the instant motion reflects a clear error in the Court’s prior Order, or persuades the Court that
13 it made any error in reaching its decision.
14

15
16 Accordingly, the Court hereby finds and ORDERS that Plaintiff’s Motion for
17 Reconsideration (Dkt. #12) is DENIED.
18

19 The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to Mr. Peden at 1425 Broadway, #232, Seattle,
20 WA 98122.

21 DATED this 22nd day of February 2018.
22

23
24 

25 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
26 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
27
28